



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,382	08/29/2000	SLIM SOUSSI	PF01963NA	9462
20280 7590 06/13/2011 MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 W2-55BB LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			EXAMINER LEE, JOHN J	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/13/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.MOBILITY@MOTOROLA.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/651,382	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SOUISSI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOHN J. LEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36, 40, 42, 44-48 and 52-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 37-39, 41, 43 and 49-51 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-36, 40, 42, 44-48, and 52-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 34-36, 40, 42, 44-48, and 52-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bajikar (US 7,126,527) in view of Camp, Jr, et al. (US 6,070,078).

Regarding **claim 34**, Bajikar teaches a method in a mobile wireless communication handset (150 in Fig. 1). Bajikar teaches that receiving base station location information (receiving base station location information of cellular base station in relative close proximity) of a cellular communication base station (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 28 – column 5, lines 56). Bajikar teaches that receiving a base station cellular area information (receiving measured location information such as distances between stations (base and mobile and/or base and base) or a geological survey or other physical measurement techniques or result of location readings for cellular communication base station) for the cellular communication base station for which the base station location information is received (Fig. 1, 2 and column 3, lines 28 – column 5,

lines 56). Bajikar teaches that determining a course location (setting and providing a course location of mobile station based on measured location information (cellular area information) and known location information (base station location information)) of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the distance to serving base station information and on the cellular area information (Fig. 1, 2, 4, column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, and column 3, lines 28 – column 5, lines 56). Bajikar does not specifically disclose the limitation “determining, at the mobile wireless communication handset, a course location of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the distance to serving base station information and on the cellular area information”. However, Camp teaches the limitation “determining, at the mobile wireless communication handset, a course location of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the distance to serving base station information and on the cellular area information” (see abstract, column 2, lines 25 – 54, Fig. 1, and column 3, lines 50 – column 4, lines 65, where teaches determining, at wireless communication telephone, approximate location of the wireless telephone using base station location information and cellular area information). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bajikar’s system as taught by Camp, provide the motivation to achieve enhancing calculating and determining location of wireless telephone using received information in the wireless telephone.

Regarding **claim 35**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation as discussed in claim 34. Furthermore, Bajikar further teaches that determining a refined location of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the course location (Fig. 1, 2, 4 and

column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, where teaches determined obtaining advantageous sets of stations for certain locations).

Regarding **claim 36**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation as discussed in claim 34. Furthermore, Bajikar further teaches that the mobile wireless communication handset (10 in Fig. 2) is a global positioning system (GPS) (Fig. 6) enabled mobile wireless communication handset (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20), determining a GPS based location (determining location by GPS) of the mobile wireless communication device (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20), reducing a GPS search space with the course location when determining the GPS based location of the mobile wireless communications handset (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20, where teaches improving measuring precise location and saving resource using the course location as determining location by GPS).

Regarding **claim 40**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation as discussed in claim 34. Furthermore, Bajikar further teaches that receiving bearing information (GPS information) from the cellular communication base station (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20). Bajikar teaches that determining a course location (setting and providing a course location of mobile station based on measured location information (cellular area information) and known location information (base station location information)) of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the base station location information, and the base station cellular area information (Fig. 1, 2, 4, column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, and column 3, lines 28 – column 5, lines 56), and bearing information (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20).

Regarding **claim 42**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation as discussed in claims 34 and 35.

Regarding **claim 44**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation as discussed in claim 34. Furthermore, Bajikar further teaches that receiving bearing information (GPS information) from a plurality of at least two base stations (Fig. 1, 6 and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20, where teaches receiving GPS information from a plurality base station or satellites). Bajikar teaches that determining a coarse location of the mobile wireless communications handset (setting and providing a coarse location of mobile station based on measured location information (cellular area information) and known location information (base station location information)) based on the bearing information (GPS information) (Fig. 1, 2, 6, column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20). Bajikar teaches that determining, at the mobile wireless communication handset, a refined location of the mobile wireless communication handset based on the coarse location (Fig. 1, 2, 4 and column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, where teaches determined obtaining advantageous sets of stations for certain locations based on the coarse location).

Regarding **claim 45**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 34 and 36.

Regarding **claim 46**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 34 and 44.

Regarding **claim 47**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 34 and 44.

Regarding **claim 48**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 34 and 44.

Regarding **claim 52**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 40 and 44. Furthermore, Bajikar teaches that the transmitting the base station location information, the cellular area, the bearing information in a provided base station almanac message (Fig. 1, 2, 6, column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20).

Regarding **claim 53**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 40 and 44. Furthermore, Bajikar further teaches that the transmitting the base station location information, cellular area, the bearing information in a common message (Fig. 1, 2, 6, column 6, lines 10 – column 8, lines 4, and column 9, lines 11 – column 10, lines 20).

Regarding **claim 54**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 34, and 44.

Regarding **claim 55**, Bajikar and Camp teach all the limitation, as discussed in claims 44 and 54.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 37-39, 41, 43, 49, 50, and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 37-39, 41, 43, 49, 50, and 51, the cited prior art fail to disclose the limitation “receiving a bearing angular width information for the cellular communication base station, and determining the coarse location of the mobile wireless handset based on the base station location information, the base station cellular area information, the bearing information, and the power measurement” in such particular context as specified in the claims.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



***Conclusion***

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
Or P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313

or faxed (571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window  
(now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7880**.  
He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00  
pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Nay**  
**Maung**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7882**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to  
the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone  
number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L  
June 4, 2011

John J Lee

/JOHN LEE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Application/Control Number: 09/651,382  
Art Unit: 2618

Page 9